arXiv:1405.1189v4 [math.OC] 21 Aug 2014

The Huge Multiway Table Problem

Shmuel Onn

Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel
onn@ie.technion.ac.il

Abstract

Deciding the existence of an $l\times m\times n$ integer threeway table with given line-sums is NP-complete already for fixed $l=3$, but is in P with both l,m fixed. Here we consider *huge* tables, where the variable dimension n is encoded in *binary*. Combining recent results on integer cones and Graver bases, we show that if the number of *layer types* is fixed, then the problem is in P, whereas if it is variable, then the problem is in NP intersect coNP. Our treatment goes through the more general class of n-fold integer programming problems.

1 Introduction

Consider the problem of deciding if there is a threeway table with given line-sums:

$$\text{is } \{x\in\mathbb{Z}_+^{l\times m\times n} \,:\, \sum_i x_{i,j,k}=e_{j,k}\,,\ \sum_j x_{i,j,k}=f_{i,k}\,,\ \sum_k x_{i,j,k}=g_{i,j}\} \text{ nonempty ?}$$

It is NP-complete already for $l=3$, see [3]. But, when both l,m are fixed, it is decidable in polynomial time [2], and in fact, in time which is cubic in n and linear in the binary encoding of e,f,g, see [7]. Assume throughout then that l,m are fixed, and regard each table as a tuple $x=(x^1,\ldots,x^n)$ consisting of n many $l\times m$ *layers*. We call the problem *huge* if the variable number n of layers is encoded in *binary*. We are then given t *types* of layers, where each type k has its column-sums vector $e^k\in\mathbb{Z}_+^m$ and row-sums vector $f^k\in\mathbb{Z}_+^l$. In addition, we are given positive integers $n_1,\ldots,n_t,n$ with $n_1+\cdots+n_t=n$, all encoded in binary. A feasible table $x=(x^1,\ldots,x^n)$ then must have first n_1 layers of type 1, next n_2 layers of type 2, and so on, with last n_t layers of type t. The special case of $t=1$ is the case of *symmetric* tables, where all layers have the same row and column sums, and the standard (non-huge) table problem occurs as the special case of $t=n$ and $n_1=\cdots=n_t=1$.

The huge table problem can be formally defined as follows.

Huge Table Problem. Given t types, line-sums $g \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{l\times m}$, column-sums $e^k \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$ and row-sums $f^k \in \mathbb{Z}_+^l$ for $k = 1, \ldots, t$, and positive integers $n_1, \ldots, n_t, n$ with $n_1 + \cdots + n_t = n$, all but t encoded in binary, decide the existence of a feasible table.

Note that while t may be small or fixed, the set of possible layers of type k is

$$\left\{ x^k \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{l\times m} \ : \ \sum_i x^k_{i,j} = e^k_j \, , \ \sum_j x^k_{i,j} = f^k_i \right\} \ ,$$

and may have cardinality exponential in the binary encoding of e^k, f^k, so it is not off hand clear how to even write down a single table. But we have the following.

Theorem 1.1 *The huge threeway table problem with all data but t binary encoded is in P for every fixed t and in NP intersect coNP for t variable and unary encoded.*

Since problems in NP intersect coNP are often in P, it is particularly interesting to know whether the table problem with variable t is decidable in polynomial time. This is open even for the smallest nontrivial case of $3 \times 3 \times n$ tables, where the input consists of $7t+9$ binary encoded nonnegative integers: $3t$ row-sums, $3t$ column-sums, 9 vertical line-sums, and $n_1, \ldots, n_t$. (In fact, removing obvious redundancies among the line-sums, the input amounts to $6t + 4$ binary encoded nonnegative integers.)

These results follow from broader results which we proceed to describe. The class of *n-fold integer programming* problems is defined as follows. Let A be an $(r, s) \times d$ *bimatrix*, by which we mean a matrix having an $r \times d$ block A_1 and $s \times d$ block A_2,

$$A \quad = \quad \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad .$$

Its *n-fold product* is the following $(r + sn) \times (dn)$ matrix,

$$A^{(n)} \quad := \quad \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_1 & \cdots & A_1 \\ A_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & A_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad .$$

The n-fold integer programming problem is then the following,

$$\min \left\{ wx \ : \ x \in \mathbb{Z}^{dn} \, , \ A^{(n)}x = b \, , \ l \leq x \leq u \right\} \ ,$$

where $w \in \mathbb{Z}^{dn}$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+sn}$, and $l, u \in \mathbb{Z}_\infty^{dn}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_\infty := \mathbb{Z} \uplus \{\pm\infty\}$. For instance, optimization over multiway tables is an n-fold program, as explained later. By solving the optimization problem we mean, as usual, either finding an optimal solution, or asserting that the problem is infeasible, or that the objective is unbounded. In particular, the optimization problem includes as a special case the feasibility problem.

It was shown in [2, 8], building on [1, 9, 12], that n-fold integer programming for *fixed* bimatrix A can be solved in polynomial time. More recently, in [7], it was shown that for fixed A it can be solved in time which is cubic in n and linear in the binary encoding of w, b, l, u, and that if only the dimensions r, s, d of A are fixed but A is part of the input, then it can be solved in time cubic in n, polynomial in the unary encoding of A, and linear in the binary encoding of w, b, l, u. See [11] for a detailed treatment of the theory and applications of n-fold integer programming.

The vector ingredients of an n-fold integer program are naturally arranged in *bricks*, where $w = (w^1, \ldots, w^n)$ with $w^k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ for $k = 1, \ldots, n$, and likewise for l, u, and where $b = (b^0, b^1, \ldots, b^n)$ with $b^0 \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ and $b^k \in \mathbb{Z}^s$ for $k = 1, \ldots, n$. Call an n-fold integer program *huge* if n is encoded in *binary*. More precisely, we are now given t *types* of bricks, where each type $k = 1, \ldots, t$ has its cost $w^k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, lower and upper bounds $l^k, u^k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and right-hand side $b^k \in \mathbb{Z}^s$. Also given are $b^0 \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ and positive integers $n_1, \ldots, n_t, n$ with $n_1 + \cdots + n_t = n$, all encoded in binary. A feasible point $x = (x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ now must have first n_1 bricks of type 1, next n_2 bricks of type 2, and so on, with last n_t bricks of type t. Standard n-fold integer programming occurs as the special case of $t = n$ and $n_1 = \cdots = n_t = 1$, and *symmetric* n-fold integer programming occurs as the special case of $t = 1$.

For $k = 1, \ldots, t$ the set of all possible bricks of type k is the following,

$$S^k \;:=\; \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \;:\; A_2 z = b^k \,,\; l^k \le z \le u^k\} \,.$$

We assume for simplicity that S^k is finite for all k, which is the case in most applications, such as in multiway table problems. Let $\lambda^k := (\lambda^k_z : z \in S^k)$ be a nonnegative integer tuple with entries indexed by points of S^k. Each feasible point $x = (x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ gives rise to $\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^t$ satisfying $\sum\{\lambda^k_z : z \in S^k\} = n_k$, where λ^k_z is the number of bricks of x of type k which are equal to z. Let the *support* of λ^k be $\mathrm{supp}(\lambda^k) := \{z \in S^k : \lambda^k_z \neq 0\}$. Then a *compact presentation of* x consists of the restrictions of λ^k to $\mathrm{supp}(\lambda^k)$ for all k. However, the cardinality of S^k may be exponential in the binary encoding of the data b^k, l^k, u^k, so off hand this presentation might be exponential as well. Nonetheless, we show the following.

Theorem 1.2 *Consider data for the huge n-fold integer programming problem with t types over $(r, s) \times d$ bimatrix A, with r, s, d fixed, and with $w^k, b^k, l^k, u^k, n_1, \ldots, n_t, n$ all encoded in binary. Then the following three statements hold:*

1. *If the problem is feasible then there is an optimal solution which admits a compact presentation* $\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^t$ *satisfying* $|\mathrm{supp}(\lambda^k)| \leq 2^d$ *for* $k = 1, \ldots, t$.

2. *For* t *fixed, the problem can be solved in polynomial time even if the bimatrix* A *is a variable part of the input and encoded in binary.*

3. *For* A *fixed and* t *variable and encoded in unary, the* augmentation problem *can be solved in polynomial time, namely, given a feasible point presented compactly, we can either assert that it is optimal or find a better feasible point.*

Here are some concluding remarks. First, it was shown in [4] that *every* bounded integer program can be isomorphically represented in polynomial time for some m and n as some $3 \times m \times n$ table problem. So, by the above results, for any fixed m we can handle integer programs with huge n. Second, the results on threeway tables with line-sums can be extended to tables of arbitrary fixed dimension and margins of any dimension. (A *k-margin* of a d-way table is the sum of entries in some $(d-k)$-way subtable.) We have the following theorem, stated without proof.

Theorem 1.3 *Consider the huge multiway table problem over* $m_1 \times \cdots \times m_k \times n$ *tables with* t *types, with given margins of any dimension, with* $k, m_1, \ldots, m_k$ *fixed. It is in P for every fixed* t *and in NP intersect coNP for* t *variable and unary encoded.*

2 Proofs

We begin by proving the three parts of Theorem 1.2 one by one. First, note that point $x = (x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ is feasible in the huge n-fold integer program only if each brick x^i lies in some $S^k = \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d : A_2 z = b^k, l^k \leq z \leq u^k\}$, and $A_1 \sum_{i=1}^n x^i = b^0$. So our assumption that each S^k is finite implies that the set of feasible points is finite as well. Therefore, if the program is feasible then it has an optimal solution.

The proof of part (1) makes use of a nice argument of Eisenbrand-Shmonin [5].

Proof of Theorem 1.2 part (1). Suppose the huge n-fold program is feasible. Then, as explained above, there is an optimal solution. Let x be an optimal solution with minimum value $\sum_{i=1}^n \|x^i\|^2$ with $\|z\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d z_j^2$ the Euclidean norm squared. Let $\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^t$ be a compact presentation of x. Suppose indirectly that we have $|\mathrm{supp}(\lambda^j)| > 2^d$. Then there are two vectors $y' \neq y''$ in $\mathrm{supp}(\lambda^j)$ having the same parity on each coordinate, implying $y := \frac{1}{2}(y' + y'') \in S^j$. For $k = 1, \ldots, t$ define μ^k on S^k to be the same as λ^k except that $\mu^j_{y'} := \lambda^j_{y'} - 1$, $\mu^j_{y''} := \lambda^j_{y''} - 1$ and $\mu^j_y := \lambda^j_y + 2$.

Let $\bar{x}$ be the vector whose compact presentation is given by the μ^k. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} x^i - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \bar{x}^i \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^{t} \sum_{z \in S^k} \lambda_z^k z - \sum_{k=1}^{t} \sum_{z \in S^k} \mu_z^k z \;=\; y' + y'' - 2y \;=\; 0$$

and therefore $A_1 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \bar{x}^i = A_1 \sum_{i=1}^{n} x^i = b^0$ so $\bar{x}$ is also feasible. Furthermore,

$$wx - w\bar{x} \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^{t} w^k \sum_{z \in S^k} (\lambda_z^k - \mu_z^k) z \;=\; w^j(y' + y'' - 2y) \;=\; 0$$

and therefore $\bar{x}$ is also optimal. But now we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x^i\|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\bar{x}^i\|^2 \;&=\; \sum_{k=1}^{t} \sum_{z \in S^k} (\lambda_z^k - \mu_z^k) \|z\|^2 \;=\; \|y'\|^2 + \|y''\|^2 - 2\|y\|^2 \\ &=\; \|y'\|^2 + \|y''\|^2 - 2\|\frac{1}{2}(y' + y'')\|^2 \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\|y' - y''\|^2 \;>\; 0 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to the choice of x. This completes the proof. □

The proof of part (2) uses the following beautiful result of [6] building on [5].

Proposition 2.1 (Goemans-Rothvoß). *Fix d, t. Let $S^k = \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d : A^k z \leq a^k\}$ be finite for $k = 1, \ldots, t$, and let $T = \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d : Bz \leq b\}$. Then, in polynomial time, we can decide if there are nonnegative integer tuples $\lambda^k = (\lambda_z^k : z \in S^k)$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^{t} \sum_{z \in S^k} \lambda_z^k z \in T$, in which case we can compute such λ^k of polynomial support.*

Proof of Theorem 1.2 part (2). We make use of points in $z \in \mathbb{Z}^{t(d+1)}$ and index each such point by $z = (z_0^1, z^1, \ldots, z_0^t, z^t)$ with $z_0^k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $z^k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ for $k = 1, \ldots, t$. Let $L \leq U$ be two integers. Define the following sets $S^1, \ldots, S^t$ and T in $\mathbb{Z}^{t(d+1)}$,

$$S^k \;:=\; \left\{ z \in \mathbb{Z}^{t(d+1)} \;:\; z_0^k = 1,\; A_2 z^k = b^k,\; l^k \leq z^k \leq u^k,\; z_0^i = 0,\; z^i = 0,\; i \neq k \right\} ,$$

$$T \;:=\; \left\{ y \in \mathbb{Z}^{t(d+1)} \;:\; y_0^1 = n_1, \ldots, y_0^t = n_t,\; A_1 \sum_{k=1}^{t} y^k = b^0,\; L \leq \sum_{k=1}^{t} w^k y^k \leq U \right\} .$$

Now suppose that $x = (x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ is a feasible point in the huge n-fold integer program, with objective function value $wx = v$ which satisfies $L \leq v \leq U$. Note that $\{z^k \in \mathbb{Z}^d : z \in S^k\}$ is the set of possible bricks of x of type k, and let

$\lambda^k = (\lambda^k_z : z \in S^k)$ for $k = 1, \ldots, t$ be nonnegative integer tuples with λ^k_z the number of bricks of x of type k which are equal to z^k. Let $y := \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{z \in S^i} \lambda^i_z z \in \mathbb{Z}^{t(d+1)}$.

Since x is feasible, we have

$$y^k_0 \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{z \in S^i} \lambda^i_z z^k_0 \;=\; \sum_{z \in S^k} \lambda^k_z \;=\; n_k \;, \quad k = 1, \ldots, t \;,$$

$$A_1 \sum_{k=1}^t y^k \;=\; A_1 \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{z \in S^i} \lambda^i_z z^k \;=\; A_1 \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{z \in S^k} \lambda^k_z z^k \;=\; A_1 \sum_{j=1}^n x^j \;=\; b^0 \;,$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^t w^k y^k \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^t w^k \sum_{z \in S^k} \lambda^k_z z^k \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^t w^k \sum \{x^j : x^j \text{ has type } k\} \;=\; wx \;=\; v \;.$$

So y is a nonnegative integer combination of points of $\bigcup_{k=1}^t S^k$ which lies in T.

Conversely, suppose $y = \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{z \in S^i} \lambda^i_z z$ is a nonnegative integer combination of points of $\bigcup_{k=1}^t S^k$ and $y \in T$, and let $v := \sum_{k=1}^t w^k y^k$. Then

$$\sum_{z \in S^k} \lambda^k_z \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{z \in S^i} \lambda^i_z z^k_0 \;=\; y^k_0 \;=\; n_k \;, \quad k = 1, \ldots, t \;,$$

so we can construct a vector $x = (x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ with λ^k_z bricks of type k which are equal to z^k for $k = 1, \ldots, t$ and all $z \in S^k$. We then have

$$A_1 \sum_{j=1}^n x^j \;=\; A_1 \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{z \in S^k} \lambda^k_z z^k \;=\; A_1 \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{z \in S^i} \lambda^i_z z^k \;=\; A_1 \sum_{k=1}^t y^k \;=\; b^0 \;,$$

so x is feasible in the huge n-fold program, and has objective function value

$$wx \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^t w^k \sum \{x^j : x^j \text{ has type } k\} \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^t w^k \sum_{z \in S^k} \lambda^k_z z^k \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^t w^k y^k \;=\; v \;.$$

Since d and t are fixed and $S^1, \ldots, S^t$ are finite, applying Proposition 2.1 to the S^k and T in $\mathbb{Z}^{t(d+1)}$, we can in polynomial time decide if there is a feasible point x in the n-fold program with objective function value in the interval $[L, U]$, and if there is, find a compact presentation $\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^t$ of x, each with polynomial support.

Now, using the algorithm for integer programming in fixed dimension [10], we find $L_k := \min\{w^k z : z \in S^k\}$ and $U_k := \max\{w^k z : z \in S^k\}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, t$.

Then any feasible point in the n-fold program has objective value in the interval $[\sum_{k=1}^t n_k L_k, \sum_{k=1}^t n_k U_k]$, and so by binary search on that interval and repeated application of the above procedure starting with $L := \sum_{k=1}^t n_k L_k$ and $U := \sum_{k=1}^t n_k U_k$, we can solve the huge symmetric n-fold integer program in polynomial time. □

For the proof of part (3) we need to review some facts about Graver bases. We introduce a partial order $\sqsubseteq$ on $\mathbb{Z}^n$ by $x \sqsubseteq y$ if $x_i y_i \geq 0$ and $|x_i| \leq |y_i|$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. The *Graver basis* of an integer $m \times n$ matrix B is the set $\mathcal{G}(B) \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ of all $\sqsubseteq$-minimal elements in $\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n : Bx = 0, x \neq 0\}$. It is well known that the Graver basis is a *test set* for any integer program of the form $\min\{wx : x \in \mathbb{Z}^n, Bx = b, l \leq x \leq u\}$ defined by B, that is, if x is a feasible but not optimal in that program, then there is an element $y \in \mathcal{G}(B)$ such that $x + y$ is feasible and better, see [11]. It is also known that the Graver basis of any integer matrix is finite, but it may be exponentially large. However, Graver bases of n-fold products are well behaved as we now explain. Let $n \geq g$ and let $\mathcal{G}(A^{(g)})$ be the Graver basis of the g-fold product of a bimatrix A. An *n-lifting* of $h = (h^1, \ldots, h^g) \in \mathcal{G}(A^{(g)})$ is any vector $y = (y^1, \ldots, y^n)$ such that for some $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_g \leq n$, $y^{i_1} = h^1, \ldots, y^{i_g} = h^g$ and all other bricks of y are 0.

Proposition 2.2 (see [11]). *For every bimatrix A there is a constant $g(A) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, called the* Graver complexity *of A, such that for all $n \geq g(A)$, the Graver basis $\mathcal{G}(A^{(n)})$ consists precisely of all n-liftings of elements of the Graver basis $\mathcal{G}(A^{(g(A))})$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.2 part (3). Let $g := g(A)$ be the Graver complexity of A. If $n < g$ then we can solve the n-fold program, and in particular the augmentation problem, using integer programming in fixed dimension $nd < gd$ in polynomial time [10]. So assume $n \geq g$. Let $\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^t$ be a compact presentation of a feasible point x. Suppose x is not optimal. We show how to find $y \in \mathcal{G}(A^{(n)})$ such that $x + y$ is feasible and better. In fact, we can find $y \in \mathcal{G}(A^{(n)})$ and step size $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $x + \alpha y$ is feasible and attains the best possible improvement attainable by any multiple of any Graver basis element. Consider any $h = (h^1, \ldots, h^g) \in \mathcal{G}(A^{(g)})$. Let $\biguplus_{k=1}^t \operatorname{supp}(\lambda^k)$ be the disjoint union of the supports of the λ^k (so a point which happens to be in the support of more than one λ^k appears more than once). Consider a mapping

$$\phi : \{h^1, \ldots, h^g\} \to \biguplus_{k=1}^t \operatorname{supp}(\lambda^k) \ : \ h^i \mapsto z^i \in \operatorname{supp}(\lambda^{k(i)}) \ .$$

Such a mapping provides a compact way of prescribing an n-lifting y of h. For such a lifting and any $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we will have that $x + \alpha y$ is feasible and better than x if the following conditions hold: (1) $|\phi^{-1}(z)| \leq \lambda^k_z$ for $k = 1, \ldots, t$ and all $z \in \operatorname{supp}(\lambda^k)$;

(2) $l^{k(i)} \leq z^i + \alpha h^i \leq u^{k(i)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, g$; (3) $\sum_{i=1}^{g} w^{k(i)} \alpha h^i < 0$. (Note that each h^i satisfies $A_2 h^i = 0$ and hence $A_2(z^i + \alpha h^i) = A_2 z^i = b^{k(i)}$ holds automatically.) Now, it can be checked if these conditions hold, say, with $\alpha = 1$, and if they do, the maximum α for which they hold be computed, easily in polynomial time. Moreover, a compact presentation $\mu^1, \ldots, \mu^t$ of the new better point $x + \alpha y$ can be obtained as follows. Begin by defining $\mu^k := \lambda^k$ for $k = 1, \ldots, t$. Now, for $i = 1, \ldots, g$, set

$$\mu^{k(i)}_{z^i} \;:=\; \mu^{k(i)}_{z^i} - 1, \quad \mu^{k(i)}_{z^i + \alpha h^i} := \mu^{k(i)}_{z^i + \alpha h^i} + 1 \; .$$

This provides a compact presentation of the new feasible and better point $x + \alpha y$.

Now, since the bimatrix A is fixed, so is its Graver complexity $g = g(A)$ and hence so is the number of elements $h \in \mathcal{G}(A^{(g)})$. Moreover, the number of possible lifting mappings ϕ of h is $|\biguplus_{k=1}^{t} \mathrm{supp}(\lambda^k)|^g$ which is polynomial in the size of the input which includes the compact presentation $\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^t$ of x. So by going over all $h \in \mathcal{G}(A^{(g)})$ and ϕ we can either find that there is no feasible better point of the form $x + y$ and conclude that x is optimal, or find $h \in \mathcal{G}(A^{(g)})$, mapping ϕ, $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and compact presentation $\mu^1, \ldots, \mu^t$ of that $x + \alpha y$ which gives best improvement. □

We proceed to establish Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The huge threeway table problem can be formulated as a huge n-fold integer programming problem as follows. Let $r = d = lm$ and $s = l + m$, and let $A_1 = I_{lm}$ be the $lm \times lm$ identity matrix and A_2 be the $(l + m) \times lm$ incidence matrix of the complete bipartite graph $K_{l,m}$. (So A_2 is itself an m-fold product $A = B^{(m)}$ with B the bimatrix having $B_1 = I_l$ and B_2 a row of l ones.) Index $l \times m \times n$ tables as $x = (x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ with $x^k = (x_{1,1}, \ldots, x_{l,1}, \ldots, x_{1,m}, \ldots, x_{l,m})$, set all costs $w^k_{i,j} := 0$, all lower bounds $l^k_{i,j} := 0$, and all upper bounds $u^k_{i,j} := \infty$, and arrange the row-sums, column-sums, and line sums suitably in the right-hand side vector b, with $b^0 = g$ and $b^k = (f^k, e^k)$ for $k = 1, \ldots, t$. This encodes the huge table problem as a huge n-fold integer program with a *fixed* bimatrix A.

Now, the statement of Theorem 1.1 for fixed t follows from Theorem 1.2 part (2), since solving the optimization problem in particular enables to decide feasibility,

Next, we prove the statement of Theorem 1.1 for variable t. First note that if the problem is feasible then, by Theorem 1.2 part (1) it has an optimal solution with compact presentation $\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^t$ satisfying $|\mathrm{supp}(\lambda^k)| \leq 2^{lm}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, t$, providing a polynomial certificate for feasibility and showing the problem is in NP.

We proceed to show that the problem is in coNP. Let $c := 2r + s = 2lm + (l + m)$ and define an $(r, s) \times c$ bimatrix C with blocks $C_1 := [A_1,\ I_{lm},\ 0_{lm \times (l+m)}]$ and $C_2 := [A_2,\ 0_{(l+m) \times lm},\ I_{l+m}]$ with A_1, A_2 as above. Define a huge n-fold program over the bimatrix C as follows. As before, set all lower bounds to 0 and all upper

bounds to ∞. Without loss of generality assume that all row-sums, column-sums, and line-sums are nonnegative, else there is no feasible table, and arrange them in the right-hand side vector b as before. Now index the variables as $v = (v^1, \ldots, v^n)$ with each brick of the form $v^i = [x^i, y^i, z^i]$ with $x^i, y^i \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{lm}$ and $z^i \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{l+m}$, with x^i interpreted as a layer of the sought table and y^i, z^i as slacks. There are again t types where a brick v of each type $k = 1, \ldots, t$ must satisfy $C_2 v = b^k$, and the multiplicities are $n_1, \ldots, n_t$ with $n_1 + \cdots + n_t = n$ as given for the table problem.

Now, for this auxiliary program we can always write down a compact presentation of a feasible point v defined as follows. We use the brick $a^0 := [0, b^0, b^1]$ of type 1 with multiplicity $\lambda^1_{a^0} := 1$, the brick $a^1 := [0, 0, b^1]$ of type 1 with multiplicity $\lambda^1_{a^1} := n_1 - 1$, and for $k = 2, \ldots, t$, the brick $a^k := [0, 0, b^k]$ of type k with multiplicity $\lambda^k_{a^k} := n_k$. Clearly, these bricks are nonnegative and each brick of type k indeed satisfies $C_2 v = b^k$. Moreover, $C_1 \sum_{i=1}^n v^i = C_1 \left(a^0 + \sum_{k=1}^t \lambda^k_{a^k} a^k\right) = b^0$.

Now, we consider the problem of minimizing the sum of all slack variables. Note that the value of this sum will be always nonnegative, and will be 0 if and only if all slacks are 0, which holds if and only if the restriction $x := (x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ of v is a feasible table, which holds if and only if the table problem is feasible.

Suppose now the table problem is infeasible. By Theorem 1.2 part (1), the auxiliary program has an optimal solution, i.e. v minimizing the sum of slack variables, with compact presentation λ^k satisfying $|\mathrm{supp}(\lambda^k)| \leq 2^{2lm+l+m}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, t$. Now, using this compact presentation, we can compute the sum of slacks and verify that it is positive, and using Theorem 1.2 part (3), we can verify that v is indeed an optimal solution, in polynomial time. This proves that the problem is in coNP. □

References

[1] Aoki, S., Takemura, A.: Minimal basis for connected Markov chain over $3 \times 3 \times K$ contingency tables with fixed two-dimensional marginals. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Statistics 45:229–249 (2003)

[2] De Loera, J., Hemmecke, R., Onn, S., Weismantel, R.: N-fold integer programming. Discrete Optimization 5:231–241 (2008)

[3] De Loera, J., Onn, S.: The complexity of three-way statistical tables. SIAM Journal on Computing 33:819–836 (2004)

[4] De Loera, J., Onn, S.: All linear and integer programs are slim 3-way transportation programs. SIAM Journal on Optimization 17:806–821 (2006)

[5] Eisenbrand, F., Shmonin, G.: Carathéodory bounds for integer cones. Operations Research Letters 34:564–568 (2006)

[6] Goemans, M.X., Rothvoß, T.: Polynomiality for Bin Packing with a Constant Number of Item Types. Symposium on Discrete Algorithms 25:830–839 (2014)

[7] Hemmecke, R., Onn, S., Romanchuk, L.: N-fold integer programming in cubic time. Mathematical Programming 137:325–341 (2013)

[8] Hemmecke, R., Onn, S., Weismantel, R.: A polynomial oracle-time algorithm for convex integer minimization. Mathematical Programming 126:97–117 (2011)

[9] Hoşten, S., Sullivant, S.: Finiteness theorems for Markov bases of hierarchical models. Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series A 114:311–321 (2007)

[10] Lenstra, H.W., Jr.: Integer programming with a fixed number of variables. Mathematics of Operations Research 8:538–548 (1983)

[11] Onn, S.: Nonlinear Discrete Optimization. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics, European Mathematical Society (2010), available online at: `http://ie.technion.ac.il/∼onn/Book/NDO.pdf`

[12] Santos, F., Sturmfels, B.: Higher Lawrence configurations. Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series A 103:151–164 (2003)